arXiv:1606.06078v1 [math.DS] 20 Jun 2016

FOURIER COEFFICIENTS OF $\times p$-INVARIANT MEASURES

HUICHI HUANG

ABSTRACT. We define densities $D_\Sigma(A)$, $\overline{D}_\Sigma(A)$ and $\underline{D}_\Sigma(A)$ for a subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ with respect to a sequence Σ of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$ and study Fourier coefficients of ergodic, weak-mixing and strong-mixing $\times p$-invariant measures on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}$. Combining these, we prove the following measure rigidity results: on $\mathbb{T}$, the Lebesgue measure is the only continuous $\times p$-invariant measure satisfying one of the following: (1) μ is ergodic and there exist a Følner sequence Σ in $\mathbb{N}$ and a nonzero integer l such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for all j in a subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ with $D_\Sigma(A)=1$; (2) μ is weak-mixing and there exist a Følner sequence Σ in $\mathbb{N}$ and a nonzero integer l such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for all j in a subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ with $\overline{D}_\Sigma(A)>0$; (3) μ is strong-mixing and there exists a nonzero integer l such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for infinitely many j. Moreover, a $\times p$-invariant measure satisfying (2) or (3) is either the Dirac measure δ_0 or the Lebesgue measure.

1. INTRODUCTION

There are two motivations for this paper. Both are related to the celebrated $\times p, \times q$ conjecture by H. Furstenberg. The first motivation is Lyons' Theorem and Rudolph-Johnson's Theorem, and the second is a theorem due to M. Einsiedler and A. Fish.

For an integer p, consider the group homomorphism T_p (called the $\times p$ map) on the unit circle $\mathbb{T}=\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ given by $T_p(x)=px \mod \mathbb{Z}$ for all x in $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$.

When p and q are positive integers greater than 1 with $\frac{\log p}{\log q}\notin\mathbb{Q}$, H. Furstenberg gave a classification of $\times p, \times q$-invariant closed subsets in $\mathbb{T}$ [Fur67, Thm. IV.1].

Theorem 1.1. [Furstenberg, 1967]

A $\times p, \times q$-invariant closed subset in $\mathbb{T}$ is either finite or $\mathbb{T}$.

Motived by this, H. Furstenberg conjectured a classification of $\times p, \times q$-invariant measures.

Date: June 21, 2016.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 37A25, 28D05, 37B99.

Key words and phrases. Fourier coefficients, density, $\times p$-invariant measure, ergodic, weak-mixing, strong-mixing.

Conjecture. [Furstenberg's $\times p, \times q$ conjecture]

For two positive integers $p, q \geq 2$ with $\frac{\log p}{\log q} \notin \mathbb{Q}$, an ergodic $\times p, \times q$-invariant measure on $\mathbb{T}$ is either finitely supported or the Lebesgue measure. That is, the only continuous $\times p, \times q$-invariant measure on $\mathbb{T}$ is the Lebesgue measure.

The first progress was made by R. Lyons in 1988 [Lyo88, Thm. 1].

Theorem 1.2. [Lyons' theorem]

Suppose p, q are relatively prime. The Lebesgue meaure is the only continuous $\times p, \times q$-invariant measure which is T_p-exact.

A measure μ is T_p-exact means $h_\mu(T_p, \xi) > 0$ for any nontrivial finite partition ξ of $\mathbb{T}$, where $h_\mu(T_p, \xi)$ stands for the measure entropy of T_p with respect to a finite partition ξ.

In 1990, D. Rudolph improved Lyons' theorem to the following [Rud90, Thm. 4.9].

Theorem 1.3. [Rudolph's theorem]

Suppose p, q are relatively prime. A $\times p, \times q$-invariant measure μ with $h_\mu(T_p) = \sup_\xi h_\mu(T_p, \xi) > 0$ must be the Lebesgue measure.

Rudolph's theorem was strengthened by A. S. A. Johnson [Joh82, Thm. A].

Theorem 1.4. [Rudolph-Johnson's theorem]

Suppose that $\frac{\log p}{\log q} \notin \mathbb{Q}$. Then a $\times p, \times q$-invariant measure with $h_\mu(T_p) > 0$ is the Lebesgue measure.

In this paper by assuming that a continuous $\times p$-invariant measure μ satisfies weaker conditions than T_p-exactness or positive entropy, we prove that if μ is invariant under enough many $\times q$-maps of special forms, then μ is the Lebesgue measure.

Theorem 5.1. The Lebesgue measure is the only continuous $\times p$-invariant measure on $\mathbb{T}$ satisfying one of the following:

(1) it is ergodic and there exist a nonzero integer l and a Følner sequence $\Sigma = \{F_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathbb{N}$ such that μ is $\times(p^j + l)$-invariant for all j in $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $D_\Sigma(A) = 1$;

(2) it is weak-mixing and there exist a nonzero integer l and a Følner sequence $\Sigma = \{F_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathbb{N}$ such that μ is $\times(p^j + l)$-invariant for all j in $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ with $\overline{D}_\Sigma(A) > 0$;

(3) it is strong-mixing and there exist a nonzero integer l and an infinite set $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$ such that μ is $\times(p^j + l)$-invariant for all j in A.

Moreover, a $\times p$-invariant measure satisfying (2) or (3) is either the Dirac measure δ_0 concentrated at 0 or the Lebesgue measure.

Here $D_\Sigma(A)$ and $\overline{D}_\Sigma(A)$ are density and upper density of A with respect to Σ respectively. See Section 2 for their definitions.

The second motivation is a theorem due to M. Einsiedler and A. Fish [EF10, Thm. 1.2].

Theorem 1.5. [Einsiedler&Fish, 2010]

For a multiplicative semigroup S of positive integers with

$$\liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log |S \cap [1,n]|}{\log n} > 0,$$

if a Borel probability measure on $\mathbb{T}$ is an ergodic $\times p$-invariant measure for some p in S and is $\times q$-invariant for every q in S, then it is either finitely supported or Lebesgue measure.

As an application of Theorem 5.1, we prove that there exists a multiplicative semigroup S of positive integers with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{\log |S \cap [1,n]|}{\log n} = 0$ such that Theorem 1.5 still holds (see Proposition 5.3).

The paper is organized as follows.

Firstly we give definitions of density functions of a subset A of nonnegative integers with respect to a Følner sequence. In Section 3, we lay down some basic facts about Fourier coefficients of a measure on the unit circle. In Section 4, we give the characterizations of ergodic, weak-mixing and strong-mixing $\times p$-invariant measures via their Fourier coefficients. In the last section, we prove the main theorem, Theorem 5.1. Applying it, we prove Proposition 5.3 at the end.

Acknowlegements

This paper was started when I was a postdoctoral fellow supported by ERC Advanced Grant No. 267079 in University of Münster. Part of work was carried out during a visit to Shanghai in Spring 2016. I thank all members in Research Center for Operator Algebras in East China Normal University, in particular, Huaxin Lin for warm hospitality. I also thank Kunyu Guo and Kai Wang for their support during my stay in Fudan University.

2. Preliminaries

Let $\mathbb{N}$ stand for the set of nonnegative integers and $\mathbb{Z}^+$ stand for the set of positive integers. Throughout this article, for two integers $a < b$, we denote the set $\{a, \cdots, b\}$ by $[a, b]$. Denote by $|F|$ the cardinality of a set F.

The following definition of Følner sequence in $\mathbb{N}$ is a special case of Følner sequences in an amenable semigroup [Bow71, p.2].

Definition 2.1. A sequence $\Sigma = \{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of finite subsets in $\mathbb{N}$ is called a **Følner sequence** if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|(F_n + m)\Delta F_n|}{|F_n|} = 0$$

for every m in $\mathbb{N}$.

The density $D(A)$ of a subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ is given by $D(A) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|A \bigcap [0, n-1]|}{n}$. The upper density of A, $\overline{D}(A) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{|A \bigcap [0, n-1]|}{n}$ and the lower density of A, $\underline{D}(A) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{|A \bigcap [0, n-1]|}{n}$. These densities are defined via the sequence of finite subsets $\{[0, n-1]\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathbb{N}$. Generalizing these, one can define densities of A with respect to every sequence of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$.

Definition 2.2. Let $\Sigma = \{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ be a sequence of finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$. The density $D_\Sigma(A)$ of a subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ with respect to Σ is given by

$$D_\Sigma(A) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{|A \bigcap F_n|}{|F_n|}.$$

The upper density $\overline{D}_\Sigma(A) := \limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{|A \bigcap F_n|}{|F_n|}$, and the lower density $\underline{D}_\Sigma(A) := \liminf_{n\to\infty} \frac{|A \bigcap F_n|}{|F_n|}$.

Remark 2.3. (1) Denote $\bigcup F_n$ by F. Then $D_\Sigma(A) = D_\Sigma(A \bigcap F)$.

(2) The density $D_\Sigma(A)$ depends on choices of Σ. For instance, let $A = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} [2^n, 2^n + n]$. For the Følner sequence $\Sigma = \{F_m\}_{m=1}^{\infty}$ with $F_m = [1, m]$, one has $D_\Sigma(A) = 0$. On the other hand $D_{\Sigma'}(A) = 1$ for the Følner sequence $\Sigma' = \{[2^n, 2^n + n]\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$.

Within this paper, a measure on a compact metrizable X always means a Borel probability measure. A measure μ is called **continuous** if $\mu\{x\} = 0$ for every x in X.

A topological dynamical system consists of a compact metrizable space X and a continuous map $T : X \to X$.

A measure μ on X is called **T-invariant** if $\mu(B) = \mu(T^{-1}B)$ for any Borel subset B of X. A T-invariant measure μ is called **ergodic** if every Borel subset B with $T^{-1}B = B$ satisfies that $\mu(B)^2 = \mu(B)$, it is called **weak-mixing** if $\mu \times \mu$ is an ergodic $T \times T$-invariant measure on $X \times X$, and it is called **strong-mixing** if $\lim_{j\to\infty} \mu(T^{-j}A \cap B) = \mu(A)\mu(B)$ for all Borel subsets A, B in X.

It's well-known that strong-mixing$\Longrightarrow$weak-mixing$\Longrightarrow$ergodic.

Within this paper, we only consider that $X = \mathbb{T}$ and $T = T_p$ is the $\times p$ map on $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ defined by $T_p(x) = px \mod \mathbb{Z}$ for all x in $\mathbb{R}/\mathbb{Z}$ and p in $\mathbb{Z}$.

3. Some basic facts about Fourier coefficients

Denote the support of μ by $\mathrm{Supp}(\mu)$. For n in $\mathbb{Z}$, the **Fourier coefficient** $\hat{\mu}(n)$ of a measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ is given by $\hat{\mu}(n) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} z^n \, d\mu(z)$ when taking $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} || z| = 1\}$.

Lemma 3.1. For nonzero k in $\mathbb{Z}$ and c in $\mathbb{T}$, $\int_{\mathbb{T}} |z^k - c|^2 \, d\mu(z) = 0$ if and only if $\mathrm{Supp}(\mu) \subseteq \{z | z^k = c\}$.

Proof. Obvious. □

Proposition 3.2. For a nonzero integer k, one has $|\hat{\mu}(k)| < 1$ if and only if there is no c in $\mathbb{T}$ such that $\mathrm{Supp}(\mu) \subseteq \{z | z^k = c\}$.

Proof. Let k be a nonzero integer. By Lemma 3.1, it suffices to show that $|\hat{\mu}(k)| < 1$ if and only if $\int_{\mathbb{T}} |z^k - c|^2 \, d\mu(z) > 0$ for all $c \in \mathbb{T}$.

If $|\hat{\mu}(k)| < 1$, then for any $c \in \mathbb{T}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{T}} |z^k - c|^2 \, d\mu(z) &= \int_{\mathbb{T}} (z^k - c)(\bar{z}^k - \bar{c}) d\mu(z) \\ &= 2 - 2Re(\bar{c}\hat{\mu}(k)) \geqslant 2 - 2|\hat{\mu}(k)| > 0.\end{aligned}$$

Conversely assume that $\int_{\mathbb{T}} |z^k - c|^2 \, d\mu(z) > 0$ for all $c \in \mathbb{T}$. When choosing $c \in \mathbb{T}$ such that $c\hat{\mu}(k) = |\hat{\mu}(k)|$, we get $0 < \int_{\mathbb{T}} |z^k - c|^2 \, d\mu(z) = 2 - 2|\hat{\mu}(k)|$, which implies that $|\hat{\mu}(k)| < 1$. □

4. Fourier coefficients of ergodic, weak-mixing or strong-mixing $\times p$-invariant measures

In this section, we give characterizations of ergodic, weak-mixing and strong-mixing $\times p$-invariant measures via their Fourier coefficients.

Theorem 4.1. The following are true.

(1) A measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ is an ergodic $\times p$-invariant measure if and only if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} \hat{\mu}(kp^j + l) = \hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)$$

for any Følner sequence $\Sigma = \{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ and k, l in $\mathbb{Z}$.

(2) A measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ is a weak-mixing $\times p$-invariant measure if and only if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} |\hat{\mu}(kp^j + l) - \hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)|^2 = 0$$

for any Følner sequence $\Sigma = \{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ and k, l in $\mathbb{Z}$.

(3) A measure μ on $\mathbb{T}$ is a strong-mixing $\times p$-invariant measure if and only if

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \hat{\mu}(kp^j + l) = \hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)$$

for all k, l in $\mathbb{Z}$.

To prove (1) and (2) of Proposition 4.1, we need a preliminary result, which is a special case of von Neumann's mean ergodic theorem for amenable semigroups proved by Bowley [Bow71, Thm. 1].

Lemma 4.2. For a topological dynamical system (X, T), if ν is an ergodic T-invariant measure on X, then for any Følner sequence $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathbb{N}$, one has

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} f(T^j x) = \int_X f \, d\nu$$

for every f in $L^2(X, \nu)$ (note that the identity holds with respect to L^2-norm). Consequently

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} \int_X f(T^j x) g(x) \, d\nu(x) = \int_X f \, d\nu \int_X g \, d\nu$$

for every f, g in $L^2(X, \nu)$

The next lemma is needed to prove (2) of Proposition 4.1 and is a generalization of [Wal82, Thm. 1.20]. Their proofs are very similar.

Let Y be a set. For a sequence $\Sigma = \{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ of finite subsets of Y, denote $\cup F_n$ by F. Consider the set of complex numbers $\{a_j\}_{j\in F}$ with $\sup_{j\in F}|a_j| \leq M$. The notation $\lim_{\Sigma} a_j = a$ for a complex number a means that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N such that whenever $n > N$, one has $|a_j - a| < \varepsilon$ for all $j \in F_n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^{N} F_k$.

Lemma 4.3. Use the same notation as above and consider a bounded sequence of complex numbers $\{a_j\}_{j\in F}$. The following are equivalent:

(1) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} |a_j| = 0.$

(2) $\lim_{\substack{\Sigma \\ j\notin J}} a_j = 0$ for $J \subseteq F$ with $D_\Sigma(J) = 0$.

(3) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} |a_j|^2 = 0.$

Proof. It suffices to prove (1)$\Longleftrightarrow$(2).

(1)$\Longrightarrow$(2). For a positive integer k, let $J_k = \{j \in F || a_j| \geq \frac{1}{k}\}$. Then for every positive integer k, we have $J_k \subseteq J_{k+1}$ and $D_\Sigma(J_k) = 0$ since

$$\frac{|J_k \bigcap F_n|}{|F_n|}\frac{1}{k} \leq \frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}|a_j|.$$

So for every k, there exists l_k such that

$$\frac{|J_k \bigcap F_n|}{|F_n|} < \frac{1}{k}$$

for all $n > l_k$. We may assume that $l_k < l_{k+1}$ for every k.

Define $J = \bigcup_k J_k \bigcap (\bigcup_{l>l_k}^{l_{k+1}} F_l \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{l_k} F_i)$.

Next we prove two claims:

- $\lim_{\substack{\Sigma \\ j\notin J}} a_j = 0.$
- $D_\Sigma(J) = 0.$

For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists k such that $\frac{1}{k} < \varepsilon$.

We want to prove that $|a_j| < \frac{1}{k}$ for all j in $F_N \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^{l_{k+1}} F_i \bigcup J)$ with $N > l_{k+1}$.

Since $J_k \subseteq J_{k+1} \subseteq \cdots$, one has $\bigcup_{i=1}^{l_{k+1}} F_i \bigcup J = \bigcup_{i=1}^{l_{k+1}} F_i \bigcup J_k$.

Hence $F_N \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^{l_{k+1}} F_i \bigcup J) = (F_N \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^{l_{k+1}} F_i)) \bigcap (F_N \setminus J_k)$. So every j in $F_N \setminus (\bigcup_{i=1}^{l_{k+1}} F_i \bigcup J)$ does not belong to J_k. This proves the first claim.

Again for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists k such that $\frac{1}{k} < \varepsilon$. When $n \geq l_k$, there exists $m \geq k$ such that n locates in $(l_m, l_{m+1}]$. So $J \bigcap F_n = J_k \bigcap F_n$ and

$$\frac{|J \bigcap F_n|}{|F_n|} = \frac{|J_k \bigcap F_n|}{|F_n|} < \frac{1}{k} < \varepsilon.$$

Hence $D_\Sigma(J) = 0$.

(2)$\Longrightarrow$(1). Suppose $\lim_{\substack{\Sigma \\ j \notin J}} a_j = 0$ for $J \subseteq F$ with $D_\Sigma(J) = 0$. This means for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists N such that for all $n > N$, we have $|a_j| < \varepsilon$ for all j in $F_n \setminus (\bigcup_{k=1}^N F_k \cup J)$. Assume that $|a_j| \leq M$ for all j. Then for any $\varepsilon > 0$, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} |a_j| \\
=&\limsup_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} [\sum_{j\in F_n \bigcap \bigcup_{k=1}^N F_k} + \sum_{j\in F_n \setminus (\bigcup_{k=1}^N F_k \cup J)} + \sum_{j\in (F_n \setminus \bigcup_{k=1}^N F_k) \bigcap J}] |a_j| \\
\leq&\limsup_{n\to\infty} (\frac{|\bigcup_{k=1}^N F_k| M}{|F_n|} + \varepsilon + M \frac{|F_n \bigcap J|}{|F_n|}) \\
(|F_n| \to \infty \text{ as } n \to \infty.)& \\
\leq&\varepsilon.
\end{aligned}$$

Since ε is arbitrarily chosen, this proves that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} |a_j| = 0$.

□

Proof. [Proof of Theorem 4.1]

(1) Suppose μ is an ergodic $\times p$-invariant measure on $\mathbb{T}$. Denote the $\times p$ map by T_p. Consider the measurable dynamical system $(\mathbb{T}, T_p, \mu)$. Using Lemma 4.2,

we get

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(T_p^j(x))g(x)\,d\mu(x)=\int_{\mathbb{T}} f\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{T}} g\,d\mu$$

for all continuous functions f,g on $\mathbb{T}$. By choosing $f=z^k$ and $g=z^l$, we prove the necessity.

Now assume that $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)=\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)$ for any Følner sequence $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ and k,l in $\mathbb{Z}$. Let $l=0$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\hat{\mu}(kp^j)=\hat{\mu}(k)$$

for every k in $\mathbb{Z}$. Replacing k by kp, one has

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mu}(kp)&=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\hat{\mu}(kp^{j+1})\\&=\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n+1|}\sum_{j\in F_n+1}\hat{\mu}(kp^j)\end{aligned}$$

($\{F_n+1\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Følner sequence in $\mathbb{N}$.)

$$=\hat{\mu}(k)$$

for every k in $\mathbb{N}$. Hence μ is $\times p$-invariant.

From $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)=\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)$, we have $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(T_p^j x)g(x)\,d\mu(x)=\int_{\mathbb{T}} f\int_{\mathbb{T}} g$ for all polynomials on $\mathbb{T}$. Polynomials are dense in $L^2(\mathbb{T},\mu)$, so $\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\int_{\mathbb{T}} f(T_p^j x)g(x)\,d\mu(x)=\int_{\mathbb{T}} f\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{T}} g\,d\mu$ for all $f,g\in L^2(\mathbb{T},\mu)$. In particular, it is true for $f=g=1_A$ for a Borel subset A with $T_p^{-1}A=A$. Hence $\mu(A)=\mu(A)^2$. This proves that μ is ergodic.

(2) Suppose μ is a weak-mixing $\times p$-invariant measure on $\mathbb{T}$, which means, $\mu\times\mu$ is an ergodic $T_p\times T_p$-invariant measure on $\mathbb{T}^2$. Applying the second identity of Lemma 4.2 to $X=\mathbb{T}^2$, $\nu=\mu\times\mu$ and letting $f(z_1,z_2)=z_1^k z_2^{-k}$ and $g(z_1,z_2)=z_1^l z_2^{-l}$ for any k,l in $\mathbb{Z}$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)|^2=|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2|\hat{\mu}(l)|^2.$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)|^2\\=&|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)|^2+|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2|\hat{\mu}(l)|^2-\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)\hat{\mu}(-k)\hat{\mu}(-l)-\hat{\mu}(-kp^j-l)\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l).\end{aligned}$$

So we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)|^2\\=&\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}[|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)|^2+|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2|\hat{\mu}(l)|^2-\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)\hat{\mu}(-k)\hat{\mu}(-l)-\hat{\mu}(-kp^j-l)\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)]\end{aligned}$$

(Use (1) since that μ is weak-mixing implies ergodicity of μ.)

$$=|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2|\hat{\mu}(l)|^2+|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2|\hat{\mu}(l)|^2-|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2|\hat{\mu}(l)|^2-|\hat{\mu}(k)|^2|\hat{\mu}(l)|^2=0$$

for all k,l in $\mathbb{Z}$.

On the other hand, suppose

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)|^2=0$$

for any Følner sequence $\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ in $\mathbb{N}$ and k,l in $\mathbb{Z}$.

Firstly we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)=\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l).$$

So by (1) μ is an ergodic $\times p$-invariant measure. To prove $\mu\times\mu$ is an ergodic $T_p\times T_p$-invariant measure on $\mathbb{T}^2$, it suffies to prove that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}f((T_p\times T_p)^j(z_1,z_2))g(z_1,z_2)\,d\mu(z_1)\,d\mu(z_2)=\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}f\,d\mu\,d\mu\int_{\mathbb{T}^2}g\,d\mu\,d\mu$$

for all continuous functions f and g on $\mathbb{T}^2$, which is equivalent to that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j+l_1)\hat{\mu}(k_2p^j+l_2)=\hat{\mu}(k_1)\hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_1)\hat{\mu}(l_2)$$

for all k_1,k_2,l_1,l_2 in $\mathbb{Z}$ by letting $f=z_1^{k_1}z_2^{k_2}$ and $g=z_1^{l_1}z_2^{l_2}$ whose linear spans are dense in $C(\mathbb{T}^2)$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&|\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j+l_1)\hat{\mu}(k_2p^j+l_2)-\hat{\mu}(k_1)\hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_1)\hat{\mu}(l_2)|\\\leq&|\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j+l_1)[\hat{\mu}(k_2p^j+l_2)-\hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_2)]|+|[\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j+l_1)-\hat{\mu}(k_1)\hat{\mu}(l_1)]\hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_2)|\end{aligned}$$

$$\leq |\hat{\mu}(k_2p^j + l_2) - \hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_2)| + |\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j + l_1) - \hat{\mu}(k_1)\hat{\mu}(l_1)|$$

for all k_1, k_2, l_1, l_2 in $\mathbb{Z}$.

Hence we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} |\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j + l_1)\hat{\mu}(k_2p^j + l_2) - \hat{\mu}(k_1)\hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_1)\hat{\mu}(l_2)|^2$$

$$\leq \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} [|\hat{\mu}(k_2p^j + l_2) - \hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_2)| + |\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j + l_1) - \hat{\mu}(k_1)\hat{\mu}(l_1)|]^2$$

(Cauchy-Schwarz inequality)

$$\leq 2 \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} [|\hat{\mu}(k_2p^j + l_2) - \hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_2)|^2 + |\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j + l_1) - \hat{\mu}(k_1)\hat{\mu}(l_1)|^2] = \quad 0.$$

By Lemma 4.3, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{|F_n|} \sum_{j\in F_n} |\hat{\mu}(k_1p^j + l_1)\hat{\mu}(k_2p^j + l_2) - \hat{\mu}(k_1)\hat{\mu}(k_2)\hat{\mu}(l_1)\hat{\mu}(l_2)| = 0.$$

This completes the proof.

(3) If μ is strong-mixing, then $\lim_{j\to\infty} \mu(T_p^{-j}A \cap B) = \mu(A)\mu(B)$ for all Borel subsets A and B in $\mathbb{T}$. This means $\lim_{j\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{T}} 1_A(T_p^j x)1_B(x)\, d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} 1_A\, d\mu \int_{\mathbb{T}} 1_B\, d\mu$ for all Borel subsets A and B, where 1_A stands for the characteristic function of A.

Note that linear combinations of characteristic functions are dense in $L^2(\mathbb{T}, \mu)$, so $\lim_{j\to\infty} f(T_p^j x)g(x)\, d\mu(x) = \int_{\mathbb{T}} f\, d\mu \int_{\mathbb{T}} g\, d\mu$ for all f, g in $C(\mathbb{T})$. In particular, this holds for $f = z^k$ and $g = z^l$ for k, l in $\mathbb{Z}$, which means

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \hat{\mu}(kp^j + l) = \hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)$$

for all $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$.

On the other hand, if a measure μ satisfies that

$$\lim_{j\to\infty} \hat{\mu}(kp^j + l) = \hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)$$

for all $k, l \in \mathbb{Z}$. Let $l = 0$ and replace k by kp. Then we have

$$\hat{\mu}(kp) = \lim_{j\to\infty} \hat{\mu}(kp^{j+1}) = \hat{\mu}(k)$$

for all k in $\mathbb{Z}$.

Linear combinations of z^k and z^l are polynomials on $\mathbb{T}$, which is dense in $L^2(\mathbb{T},\mu)$. Hence

$$\lim_{j\to\infty}\mu(f(T_p^j)g)=\mu(f)\mu(g)$$

for all f,g in $L^2(\mathbb{T},\mu)$. In particular, it holds for $f=1_A$ and $g=1_B$ for any Borel subsets A,B of $\mathbb{T}$, which completes the proof.

□

Remark 4.4. (1) As shown in [Lyo88], a measure μ is T_p-exact iff

$$\lim_{j\to\infty}\sup_{k\in\mathbb{Z}}|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+l)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(l)|=0$$

for every l in $\mathbb{Z}$. Hence T_p-exactness is much stronger than being strong-mixing.

(2) So far it is unknown how to characterize that $h_\mu(T_p)>0$ via Fourier coefficients of μ.

5. Rigidity of $\times p$-invariant measures

With the above preliminaries, we are ready to prove the main theorem.

Theorem 5.1. The Lebesgue measure is the only continuous $\times p$-invariant measure on $\mathbb{T}$ satisfying one of the following:

(1) it is ergodic and there exist a nonzero integer l and a Følner sequence $\Sigma=\{F_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathbb{N}$ such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for all j in $A\subseteq\mathbb{N}$ with $D_\Sigma(A)=1$;

(2) it is weak-mixing and there exist a nonzero integer l and a Følner sequence $\Sigma=\{F_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ in $\mathbb{N}$ such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for all j in $A\subseteq\mathbb{N}$ with $\overline{D}_\Sigma(A)>0$;

(3) it is strong-mixing and there exist a nonzero integer l and an infinite set $A\subseteq\mathbb{N}$ such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for all j in A.

Moreover, the Dirac measure δ_0 at 0 and the Lebesgue measure are the only $\times p$-invariant measures satisfying (2) or (3).

Proof. [Proof of the first part of Theorem 5.1]

(1) Suppose μ is an ergodic $\times p$-invariant measure and there exist a nonzero integer l and a Følner sequence $\Sigma=\{F_n\}_{n=1}^\infty$ such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for all j in $A\subseteq\mathbb{N}$ with $D_\Sigma(A)=1$.

If μ is not Lebesgue measure, then there exists nonzero k in $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $0\hat{\mu}(k)$ is nonzero.

By Theorem 4.1(1), one has

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\hat{\mu}(kp^j+kl)=\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl).$$

Note that

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}\hat{\mu}(kp^j+kl)=\frac{1}{|F_n|}[\sum_{j\in F_n\cap A}+\sum_{j\in F_n\setminus A}]\hat{\mu}(kp^j+kl)\\ =&\frac{|F_n\cap A|}{|F_n|}\hat{\mu}(k)+\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n\setminus A}]\hat{\mu}(kp^j+kl)\to\hat{\mu}(k)\end{aligned}$$

as $n\to\infty$. Hence $\hat{\mu}(k)=\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl)$. This implies that $\hat{\mu}(kl)=1$ which contradict that μ is continuous according to Proposition 3.2.

(2) Suppose μ is a weak-mixing $\times p$-invariant measure and there exist a nonzero integer l and a Følner sequence $\Sigma=\{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for all j in $A\subseteq\mathbb{N}$ with $\overline{D}_\Sigma(A)>0$.

If μ is not Lebesgue measure, then there exists nonzero k in $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\hat{\mu}(k)$ is nonzero.

By Theorem 4.1(2), one has

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+kl)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl)|^2=0.$$

It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}0=&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n}|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+kl)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl)|^2\\ \geq&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n\cap A}|\hat{\mu}(kp^j+kl)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl)|^2\\ =&\limsup_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{|F_n|}\sum_{j\in F_n\cap A}|\hat{\mu}(k)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl)|^2\\ =&|\hat{\mu}(k)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl)|^2\overline{D}_\Sigma(A).\end{aligned}$$

Hence $\hat{\mu}(k)-\hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl)=0$ which implies that $\hat{\mu}(kl)=1$. This again leads to a contradiction.

(3) Assume that μ is a strong-mixing $\times p$-invariant measure and there exist a nonzero integer l and an infinite $A\subseteq\mathbb{N}$ such that μ is $\times(p^j+l)$-invariant for all j in A.

If μ is not Lebesgue measure, then there exists nonzero k in $\mathbb{Z}$ such that $\hat{\mu}(k)$ is nonzero.

By Theorem 4.1(3), we have

$$\lim_{\substack{j\to\infty \\ j\in A}} \hat{\mu}(kp^j + kl) = \hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl).$$

On the other hand, for all $j \in A$, one has $\hat{\mu}(kp^j + kl) = \hat{\mu}(k)$. So $\hat{\mu}(k) = \hat{\mu}(k)\hat{\mu}(kl)$. Again this leads to a contradiction.

We finish the proof the first part of Theorem 5.1. □

Before proceeding to the proof of the second part of Theorem 5.1, we need a lemma.

An **atom** for a measure μ on a compact metrizable space X is a point x in X such that $\mu\{x\} > 0$.

Lemma 5.2. Let $T : X \to X$ be a continuous map on a compact metrizable space X. If a T-invariant measure μ has an atom x with $\mu\{x\} < 1$, then μ is not weak-mixing.

Proof. Suppose μ is weak-mixing and has an atom x with $\lambda = \mu\{x\} < 1$.

Note that μ is weak-mixing if and only if

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} |\mu(T^{-j}A \cap B) - \mu(A)\mu(B)|^2 = 0$$

for all Borel subsets A, B of X [Wal82, Defn. 1.5(i)&Thm. 1.24].

Choose $A = X \setminus \{x\}$ and $B = \{x\}$. Note that $\mu(T^{-j}A \cap B)$ can only have two possible values: 0 or λ, hence for all j, we have

$$|\mu(T^{-j}A \cap B) - \mu(A)\mu(B)| \geq \min\{\lambda(1-\lambda), \lambda - \lambda(1-\lambda)\} \geq c$$

for some constant $c > 0$. This leads to a contradiction. □

Now we are ready to finish the proof of Theorem 5.1.

Proof. [Proof of the second part of Theorem 5.1]

It follows from Theorem 4.1, Theorem 5.1, Lemma 5.2 and the fact that $\widehat{\delta_0}(k) = 1$ for all k in $\mathbb{Z}$. □

We end this paper with the following proposition.

Proposition 5.3. There exists a multiplicative semigroup S in $\mathbb{Z}^+$ satisfying the following:

(1) $\lim_{n\to\infty} \dfrac{\log |S \cap [1, n]|}{\log n} = 0;$

(2) $p \in S$;

(3) a continuous ergodic $\times p$-invariant measure which is $\times q$-invariant for all q in S is the Lebesgue measure.

Proof. Define $F_n = [p^n, p^n + n]$ for every positive integer n. Then $\Sigma = \{F_n\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$ is a Følner sequence in $\mathbb{N}$. Denote $\bigcup F_n$ by A.

Let S be the multiplicative semigroup generated by p and $p^j + 1$ for all $j \in A$.

Since $D_\Sigma(A) = 1$, by (1) of Theroem 5.1, a continuous ergodic $\times p$-invariant measure which is $\times q$-invariant for all q in S must be the Lebesgue measure.

The remaining thing is to prove that $\lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \dfrac{\log |S \cap [1, n]|}{\log n} = 0$.

Every positive integer $n \geq p$ locates in $[p^{p^m}, p^{p^{m+1}})$ for some nonnegative integer m.

Consider $S \cap [1, n]$.

Firstly $|\{k \,|p^k \leq n\}| \leq p^{m+1}$. Also

$$|\{j \in A | p^j + 1 \leq n\}| \leq 1 + 2 + \cdots + m \leq \frac{m(m+1)}{2}.$$

For every such j, one has $|\{k \,|(p^j + 1)^k \leq n\}| \leq p^{m+1}$.

Hence

$$|S \cap [1, n]| \leq (p^{m+1})^{1+\frac{m(m+1)}{2}}.$$

It follows that

$$\frac{\log_p |S \bigcap [1, n]|}{\log_p n} \leq \frac{\log_p (p^{m+1})^{1+\frac{m(m+1)}{2}}}{\log_p p^{p^m}} = \frac{(1 + \frac{m(m+1)}{2})(m+1)}{p^m} \to 0$$

as $n \to \infty$ (correspondingly $m \to \infty$).

□

References

[Bow71] T. Bowley. Extension of the Birkhoff and von Neumannn ergodic theorems to semigroup actions. *Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré* Sect. B (N.S.) **7** (1971), 283--291.

[EF10] M. Einsiedler and A. Fish. Rigidity of measures invariant under the action of a multiplicative semigroup of polynomial growth on $\mathbb{T}$. *Ergodic Theory Dynam. Systems* **30** (2010), no. 1, 151–157.

[EF11] M. Einsiedler and T. Ward. *Ergodic Theory with A View towards Number Theory.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **259**. Springer-Verlag, London, 2011.

[Fur67] H. Furstenberg. Disjointness in ergodic theory, minimal sets, and a problem in Diophantine approximation. *Math. Systems Theory* **1** (1967), 1–49.

[Joh82] A. S. A. Johnson. Measures on the circle invariant under multiplication by a nonlacunary subsemigroup of the integers. *Israel J. Math.* **77** (1992), no.1-2, 211–240.

[Lyo88] R. Lyons. On measures simultaneously 2- and 3-invariant. *Israel J. Math.* **61** (1988), no. 2, 219--224.

[Rud90] D. J. Rudolph. $\times 2$ and $\times 3$ invariant measures and entropy. *Ergod. Th. and Dynam. Syst.* **10**, (1990), 395–406.

[Wal82] P. Walters. *An Introduction to Ergodic Theory.* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, **79**. Springer-Verlag, New York-Berlin, 1982.

Huichi Huang, College of Mathematics and Statistics, Chongqing University, Chongqing, 401331, PR China

E-mail address: huanghuichi@cqu.edu.cn